

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-38 were pending in the above-identified patent application.

Claim 27 was objected to because of an informality.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 27, 30, 33, and 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gould et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,652,529 (hereinafter "Gould") in view of Meacham U.S. Patent No. 4,059,842 (hereinafter "Meacham").

Claims 11 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gould and Meacham in view of Steele U.S. Patent No. 4,983,857 (hereinafter "Steele").

Claims 3, 4, 8-10, 12, 29, 31, 32, and 34 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 13-26 were allowed.

Reconsideration of this application in light of the following remarks is hereby respectfully requested.

Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claim 27 to correct an informality.

Applicants have also amended claims 1, 11, and 27 to more particularly define the claimed invention. Applicants have cancelled claims 12 and 28-29 without prejudice.

No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the originally-filed specification.

The Examiner's objection and rejection are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' Reply to the Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to claim 27 because of the following informality: "Claim 27, line 4, after 'circuitry,' insert -and-" (Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 2).

Applicants have amended claim 27 to correct this informality. Accordingly, this objection is now moot.

Claims 1-11, 27, and 30-38

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 27, 30, 33, and 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gould in view of Meacham. Claims 11 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gould and Meacham in view of Steele. Claims 3, 4, 8-10, 12, 29, 31, 32, and 34 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the features of dependent claims 11 and 12. Applicants have also amended independent claim 27 to incorporate the features of dependent claims 28 and 29. Accordingly, because independent claims 1 and 27 now

Application No. 10/621,074
Amendment Dated October 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2005

include allowable subject matter, this rejection is now moot.

Claims 13-26

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 13-26.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-11, 13-27, and 30-38, is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt consideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak

Evelyn C. Mak
Registration No. 50,492
Attorney for Applicants

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 36981
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000